Kelley, H.O.
1932

The case of military training in American schools and colleges.

School of Education
July 14-1932
9934

9934.

EdI
Thesis
Kelley
1932
Stacks

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Thesis

THE CASE OF MILITARY TRAINING IN AMERICAN SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES.

Submitted by

HENRY O. KELLEY

(B. S. in Ed., Boston University, 1930)

In partial fulfilment of requirements
for degree of Master of Education.

1932

First Reader: Jesse B. Davis, Professor of Education, Boston University

Second Reader: Edward S. Eaton, Professor of Education, Boston University

Boston University
School of Education
Library

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

Introduction - Our Military Policy..... 1

I - History of Military Training in American Schools and Colleges..... 7

II - The National Defense Act of 1920 and the R. O. T. C.....13

III - Other Types of Military Training.....23

IV - The Extent and Status of Military Training at the Present Time.....36

V - Study of Arguments for Military Training as found in Catalogues of Military Schools.....57

VI - Study of Opinions of Educators.....62

VII - Summary and Conclusions.....87

INTRODUCTION -OUR MILITARY POLICY

The military policy of the United States from the beginning of the Revolutionary War down to and including the declaration of war against Germany in 1917 has always been characterized by:

First: The entrance of the U. S. into war without an army with which to fight the war.

Second: The organization and development of the war army during the progress of the war.

Third: The breaking up of the war army immediately following the conclusion of the war.

The saddest thing about our unpreparedness has been the terrific loss of life due to the lack of training, discipline, and leadership. This has been the case in every war in which the nation has engaged.

"Men just dragged from the tender scenes of domestic life, unaccustomed to the din of arms, totally unacquainted with every kind of military skill, are timid and ready to fly from their own shadows." (George Washington, Sept. 24, 1776.)

"It is murder for an enlightened nation to send raw troops into battle." (Col. Harry Lee of Virginia.)

Failing to learn the lessons taught by the Revolution, Congress passed the following legislation in 1784:

"Whereas, standing armies in time of peace are inconsistent with the principles of republican governments, dangerous to the liberties of a free people, and generally converted into destructive engines for establishing despotism;

"Be it resolved, that the commanding officer be directed

to discharge the troops now in the service of the United States, except twenty - five privates to guard the stores at Fort Pitt, and fifty - five to guard the stores at West Point and other magazines, with a proportionable number of officers, no officers to remain in service above the rank of captain."

An army of eighty men for a nation of three million people! This resolution was never completely carried out, but the army and the militia were kept down to an irreducible minimum.

On March 22, 1810, Representative Randolph of Virginia, in advocating a bill to reduce the Regular Army, said:

"With respect to war - We have, thank God! in the Atlantic, a fosse wide and deep enough to keep off any immediate danger to our territory. The belligerents of Europe know, as well as we feel, that war is out of the question."

The Regular Army was reduced; but within three years British troops stood on the soil of Mr. Randolph's native state.

Thomas Jefferson declared that "the acquisition of Canada as far as Quebec will be a mere matter of marching," but history does not record the fall of Quebec, although the United States employed more than 500,000 troops against a British force which never exceeded 17,000 men.

Speaking in Congress on August 3, 1842, Mr. Edwards said:

"We have more reason to suppose that the world will grow wiser; and that the humane and oft - repeated wish of the wise and good, that the sword and the bayonet may be converted into the scythe and the plowshare will be realized."

Three years later, Representative Duncan paid his respects to West Point as "that worse than useless institution, West Point Academy, a perfect system of profligacy and extravagance, a nursery of a popinjay aristocracy."

General Scott, not a graduate, had this to say about West Pointers, however:

"I give it as my fixed opinion that but for our graduated cadets, the war between the United States and Mexico might, and probably would, have lasted some four or five years, with, in its first half, more defeats than victories falling to our share; whereas, in less than two campaigns, we conquered a great country and a peace without the loss of a single battle or skirmish."

The outbreak of the Civil War found the North with a Regular Army of 16,000 men. Most serious students of the history of that war have reached the conclusion that an available force of 50,000 regulars would have saved the country hundreds of thousands of her youth, billions of dollars, and untold suffering.

"Had enough been spent on our military establishment to make it an effective force in 1860 - only a moiety of the cost of the war - there would have been no war..... The cost was and is far greater than necessary if proper expenditures had been made before the fact instead of during and after it." (Professor Charles S. Spooner, President of the Vermont Peace Society.)

The Civil War dragged on for four years, with a great loss of life and property. We shall not lose sight of the glaring defects in military policy, such as the enlistment of ninety-day volunteers, the payment of bounties, political interference in military campaigns, and the lack of a system for training officers in time of peace.

After the Civil War, the army was flung aside and permitted to rust. In the year 1876, during the worst of the Indian wars in the West, Congress did not even bother to pay the Army.

There was no opportunity or incentive for officers to study, there was little or no chance to obtain experience in handling large bodies of troops, and the bureaus in Washington were sadly inefficient. No wonder that the system broke down in the War with Spain!

"The mistakes, the blunders, and the shortcomings in the army management during the summer of 1898 should be credited mainly, not to any one in office in 1898, but to the public servants of the people who permitted the army to rust since the Civil War," declared Theodore Roosevelt, in his indictment of Congressional "economy."

The 1916 mobilization on the Mexican Border gave the Regular Army and National Guard a much-needed opportunity to iron out the wrinkles in our military system, and Congress finally passed the National Defense Act of 1916, which gave the nation a sound military policy - on paper.

The United States entered the World War in its usual state of unpreparedness, with the usual excitement, and the usual inefficiency. It was more than a year after the declaration of war when we put a single division into the firing line, and it was seventeen months before an American army under its own leaders occupied a place in the line. And to the last, we had to depend upon the Allies for our supply of artillery, tanks, airplanes, and ammunition, as General Pershing pointed out in his memoirs, which appeared in the daily newspapers.

That our unpreparedness resulted in heavy casualties is pointed out by H. B. Mayer, in Mc Clure's Magazine for September, 1923, page 95:

"Our one major engagement , the Argonne, was a massacre of

untrained men, who died in clusters, some of them so ignorant of the art of war that they loaded their cartridges in their rifles with the bullets pointing toward themselves."

Although the statesmen and military leaders of the Allied nations expressed their admiration for the efforts of the United States Army in the World War, they were frank enough to state that our lack of preparedness resulted in heavy casualties.

"The training of the Americans was lamentably inadequate. The officers had little experience in war; consequently, they showed a tendency to attack with infantry in too close formation, which resulted in heavy losses." (General Joseph Holle, French Army)

"The Americans are fine soldiers, but their military preparedness was and will always remain insufficient to make them a decisive factor to be reckoned with at the psychological moment in case of war." (Georges Clemenceau)

The spectacle of millions of our citizens rising to their might between sun and sun to face a disciplined enemy is inspiring in peace but historically discouraging in war. Fourth of July orations and history textbooks have convinced the American public that "we can lick all creation if necessary." The public does not realize that thousands of our young men have been needlessly sacrificed due to lack of trained leadership.

In commenting on American military policy, Rudyard Kipling said:

"The big, fat Republic that is afraid of nothing, because

nothing up to the present date has happened to make her afraid, is as unprotected as a jelly-fish.

"The average American citizen seems to have a notion that any Power engaged in strife with the Star Spangled Banner will disembark men from flat-bottomed boats on a convenient beach for the purpose of being shot down by the local militia." ("American Notes," pp. 116, 119)

It might be well to point out that the Army and Navy do not create war - they are simply instruments to carry out the will of the people when round-table diplomats have failed in the task of maintaining peace. The soldier never has, never will, and never can move a foot or load a rifle until the nation, by a slow and complicated process, tells him to do so.

"Throughout our history the Army has kept itself remarkably clear of intrigues designed to bring on war." (The New Republic, May 16, 1923)

"There is in America no military caste thinking of war and regarding war as its natural occupation." (Lord Bryce)

"I know of no war in which America has been engaged, offensive or defensive, which was brought about by army pressure, or, indeed, stimulated by military desire." (Newton D. Baker)

"There is nothing beautiful about war. With all my soul I hate it. I have seen it in all its horrors.

"When war talk is in the air, you will notice that almost everybody takes a hand in it - everybody but the soldiers. The ethics of the army, the well-understood standards of conduct in it, all forbit any officer, however high, to open his mouth to such an issue." (Gen. Pershing, National Home Magazine, November, 1930, pp. 10, 11)

I History of Military Training in American Schools and Colleges.

As early as 1776, General Henry Knox urged the establishment of a school for training Army officers. Although Congress, in 1777, provided for a Corps of Invalids "to serve as a military school for young gentlemen previous to their being appointed to marching regiments," the Military Academy at West Point was not founded until 1802.

When Sylvanus Thayer became Superintendent of West Point in 1817, he organized the Corps of Cadets into a battalion, inaugurated daily marks and weekly reports of grades, and assigned cadets to academic sections according to their demonstrated ability. Since that day, West Point has had a profound influence upon military training and education, both in this country and abroad.

West Point, however, is not, and never has been, large enough to train enough officers for an Army expanded to war strength. It is therefore natural that the nation should look to its colleges for leaders fitted to "perform justly, skillfully, and magnanimously all the offices, both public and private, of peace and war," as John Milton expressed it.

Military training in educational institutions was first proposed by Thomas Jefferson, a patron saint of democracy, who said:

"We must train and classify the whole of our male citizens and make military instruction a regular part of collegiate education."

In 1819, military training was first introduced solely for

its educational advantages in what is now Norwich University, at Northfield, Vermont. The Virginia Military Institute, founded in 1837, set the example for scores of other military schools which sprang up throughout the South. There is, however, no evidence to show that military training existed in civilian schools and colleges prior to the Civil War.

The story of the Morril Land-Grant Act and of the establishment of military training is best told by Dr. W. O. Thompson, President Emeritus of Ohio State University, in the following words:

"In the midst of the late Civil War on July 2, 1862 an Act of Congress known as the Land-Grant Act made certain grants of land and landscrip for the purpose of establishing in each State which would accept its provisions "at least one College, where the leading objects shall be without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the legislature of the States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life."

"The interpretation of this Act is important to its proper and complete understanding. The question of agriculture had been before the country, especially in Illinois and Michigan and in certain agricultural circles for some time. When, however, the matter came up for consideration by Congress, the subject of mechanical arts was included because such vocations were considered to be a contribution to the national defense. The opposition to the Bill is not so important at this juncture, but

it is well to remember that the phrase "without excluding other scientific and classical studies and including military tactics" was intended to do two things; first, to make it possible to teach outside of a strict interpretation of applied science and leave some discretion to the state; the second important fact is, that military tactics was included as a positive contribution to and an essential part of the Bill. Without these two features there is reason to believe that the Bill might not have been enacted into a Law. Further, the phrase "in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe" was due to the fact that a strong factor in Congress recognized education as a state function. President Buchanan had vetoed this measure principally on the theory that the proposed legislation interfered with the right of the States in education. The pharse under consideration was intended to prevent interference by the Federal Government and to protect the rights of the States in education which by many was regarded as a function of the State. (Note; Buchanan vetoed the bill in 1859; military training was not inserted until 1862.)

"From the days of President Washington the attention of Congress had been directed to the necessity of measures to maintain the fertility of the soil. The improvement of live stock, the importance of fertilizers and the increase of production were the chief topics in the minds of the advocates of agriculture at that period. Congress was persuaded on these points. It needed no persuasion on the importance of the mechanic arts as related to national efficiency and its own motion inserted the provision to teach military tactics, a provision entirely

in harmony with the prevailing theories concerning military defense at that time. From Colonial days the Militia and later the National Guard in addition to the regular army were regarded as perfectly legitimate and desirable measures in the way of defense. West Point and Annapolis stood for the professional and official training, essential if the country were to have an available list of officers. The Act of 1862, therefore, was the natural expression of the current theory and the widely accepted idea that national defense was a part of the obligation of Congress.

"As a further comment it may be added that the provisions of the Act of 1862 were accepted by all the States of the Union. These acceptances began at once and continued thru a period of practically ten years, the time being extended by Congress in order to make abundant provision for every State in the Union to give the Act full consideration. It is important here to note that not a single State in the Union at the time of acceptance raised any objection to the subject of military science or military tactics as the statute expressed it. In other words this law as enacted was accepted by the States not on any theory of permission but on the theory of accepting a status universally recognized. That status was, that at least three things were to be taught; first, agriculture; second, mechanic arts; and third, military tactics. The phrase 'without excluding other scientific and classical studies' permits the introduction of other than three principal topics in the Act. Too often we overlook the fact that military tactics in the statute is on precisely the same basis as agriculture and the mechanic arts.

Beyond question the country accepted these colleges on the ground that the three topics named were to be a part of the body of instruction in the colleges.

"When these colleges were organized under the provisions of the Act of 1862 military tactics was just as much a part of the instruction as any other topic. No question was then raised whether it was mandatory or permissive. The colleges accepted in good faith just as the States have done the provisions of the Act without reservations. Departments of military instruction accordingly were found at the outset in every Land-Grant college. It was believed that this was keeping faith with the letter and spirit of the Act of 1862. It has remained for substantially fifty years as the prevailing custom in all Land-Grant colleges. During the passing of the years, however, the curricula of these colleges like all other curricula have undergone vigorous examination, discussion, and revision. The administrative officers of these colleges by a large and decisive majority at any time in the past twenty five years in my opinion, if a vote had been taken, would have favored the retention of military tactics as from the beginning.

"It should be recognized that during the fifty years since the war the administration of these colleges has been thru the Department of Interior, the Department of Agriculture, and the War Department. Representatives of these departments have ordinarily been in attendance at the annual meetings and have taken assigned places on the programs. During these years many conferences have been held with all of these departments as to the problems arising in administration. The War Department and the Presidents of these colleges have discussed at

great length all the questions involved in military education and its administration. As is well known the prescribed military instruction, due to limitations of the War Department and to other causes, was confined to the first two years of college; two years of military instruction varying from three to five hours per week were given in all these colleges as a required subject. The limited number of students who became cadet officers received suitable additional instruction during the Junior and Senior years."

At the close of the Civil War, many public high schools adopted a system of military drill, not connected with the War Department. There was also a gradual increase in the number of private military academies, such as Culver, Staunton, and the New York Military Academy. The main strength of military training was in the Land-Grant Colleges, however. Men who received military training in schools or colleges were able to be of great service to the nation in 1898 and 1917.

"The testimony of military officers in the World War was all to the effect that, small in amount and poor in quality as was the training given by the Land-Grant colleges, it was invaluable in those days of stress and strain when millions of untrained boys came into out camps." (Dr. David Kinley, former President, University of Illinois, in the National Defense Magazine, November 1927)

II "The National Defense Act of 1920 and the R.O.T.C.

Profiting by the expensive lessons of the World War, Congress enacted a wise piece of legislation, the National Defense Act of 1920, which provides for the Regular Army, the National Guard, the Organized Reserves, the Citizens' Military Training Camps, and the Reserved Officers' Training Corps.

In accordance with American traditions, the Regular Army is very small as compared with the armies of foreign countries. Its present strength is 12,000 officers and 118,000 enlisted men, scattered throughout the United States, Porto Rico, the Canal Zone, Alaska, Hawaii, China, and the Philippines. The Army of today is not a cloistered profession, out of contact with the public; in fact, more than two thousand officers and men are away from the Regular Army, on duty with civilian components ---the National Guard, Reserves, and R. O. T. C. The Regular officer of today is a well educated gentleman, who possesses two sets of knowledge, military and civilian, the same as he possesses two suits of clothing, military and civilian.

"It is a part of the Regular Army's creed not to be looking around for appreciation. Its time-honored traditions do not include a formula for bragging of its achievements either in war or peace. Consequently the average American citizan does not know how greatly he is indebted to the Regular Army for many things he accepts as simply another step forward in our national progress and prosperity." (Col. Noble Brandon Judah, Ambassador to Cuba, in the National Defense Magazine, February 1927)

Army men conducted nearly all preliminary explorations in the early days of our history. They built the old Cumberland Pike, the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, the Erie Canal, the Boston and Albany Railroad, the Union Pacific Railroad, and the Panama Canal, stamped yellow fever out of the tropics, organized the Department of Interior, the Weather Bureau, the Budget System, and the Geodetic Survey.

The Regular Army rendered relief to the unfortunate victims of the San Francisco fire, the Galveston flood, the Knickerbocker theater disaster, and various floods and forest fires. In 1912, the Army fed 185,000 persons and furnished shelter for 20,000 persons left homeless by the Mississippi Floods. In the spring of 1913, the Army was called upon to assist sufferers from cyclones in Nebraska and Alabama. During the fiscal year 1929, Army personnel and supplies were rushed to the relief of victims of twenty three calamaties.

While on the subject of Regular Army, it should be noted that West Point graduates have achieved distinction in many non-military activities. The "Congressional Record" of December 11, 1922, gives the following partial list of West Pointers who have made good in civil occupations:

1 President of the United States
15 Ambassadors and Ministers
24 members of Congress
16 governors
77 members of state legislatures
17 mayors of cities
46 college presidents
136 professors and teachers

87 railroad presidents

20 clergymen

228 civil engineers

14 physicians

The National Guard, successor to the old - time militia, has also performed great service to the state and nation. Like the Regular Army, the Guard has rendered relief to the victims of flood, fire, plague, and earthquake, as well as protecting the community against lawlessness. Last year, prison riots at Dannemora, New York,and at Columbus, Ohio, made it necessary to call upon the National Guard for active duty.

At present, the National Guard consists of 12,000 officers and 170,000 enlisted men, civilians who unselfishly give their spare time to the service of the people. They drill one night each week and spend two weeks in camp each summer.

"While not professional soldiers, men of the National Guard and Reserves are prompted to service by a patriotic devotion to the high conception of citizenship." (General Pershing, June 28, 1923)

The Organized Reserves consist of 113,000 officers and 5,000 men, civilians who receive little or no training. Of the total number, only 21,000 officers and no enlisted men attended 14-day training camps last summer. During the winter months reserve officers may attend bi-weekly instruction meetings and enroll in military correspondence courses.

Under the provisions of the National Defense Act, Citizens Military Training Camps have been established throughout the country for 30-day periods during the summer.. These camps are very popular, attracting high type young men between the

ages of 17 and 24. In 1930, there were 68,825 applications for enrollment, but Congress appropriated funds to take care of only 37,500 students. The boys are not paid, but the government furnishes uniforms, food, and transportation.

"The Citizens' Military Training Camps in the various corps areas have proved their value this year more than ever. Their purpose is to give the candidate a physical setting up, accustom him to the routine and discipline of army life, teach him how to handle a rifle, and put up and strike a tent, to march, to maneuver, to shoot straight, and to adjust himself to the various requirements of the camp and field." (New York Times, August 31, 1923)

Ten state Boards of Education have authorized high school credit for camp attendance; in ten other states, local boards are permitted to grant such credit if they desire. Four universities (Ohio, Washington, Dayton, and California) gave degree credit for camp attendance, and 92 colleges award competitive schloarships to C.M.T.C. students.

"The President is hereby authorized to establish and maintain in civil educational institutions a Reserve Officers' Training Corps, one or more units in number, which shall consist of a senior division organized at universities and colleges granting degrees, including state universities and those state institutions that are required to provide instruction in military tactics under the Act of July, 1862." (National Defense Act, Section 40)

This is a particularly necessary and useful provision. The framers of the National Defense Act realized the rapidity with which the survivors of the World War are reaching ages

which unfit them for active service. Their places in the Reserve Corps are being taken by young men graduating from the R.O.T.C.

"The primary object of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps is to provide systematic training at civil educational institutions for appointment as reserve officers in the Army of the United States." (National Defense Act)

In order to establish an R.O.T.C. Unit, a college or university must guarantee a minimum enrollment of 100 students in a unit of infantry, cavalry, or artillery, and 50 students in a unit of engineers, medical corps, or other branch of service.

The War Department furnishes the college with Regular Army instructors, uniforms, rifles, and equipment. The officers are detailed for four year periods, during which time they are members of the college faculty.

A Typical College Unit.

Let us examine a typical R.O.T.C. Unit, the one established at Boston University. All physically qualified male students at the College of Business Administration are required to elect either Physical Training or Military Science during their freshman and sophomore years.

Military Science for freshmen and sophomores consists of three hours and fifteen minutes work per week, for which two hours credit is given. The drill is held in the Armory every Tuesday morning from 9:15 to 11:30. The schedule of instruction includes inspection, calisthenics, close order drill, guard duty, and ceremonies. Although all the freshmen and half the sophomores drill as privates, every student is given some leadership training and an opportunity to drill a squad

Freshmen who show outstanding ability are placed in the Leadership Platoon, where they are drilled by a veteran Regular Army sergeant, and receive special instruction in the art of leadership. The best sophomores are appointed sergeants (section leaders) and corporals (squad leaders). At present there are two sophomore companies, four freshmen companies, and a band. For the past four years, there has also been a drill team or demonstration platoon of volunteers who drill on their own time. This platoon, which specializes in original drill movements, gives an exhibition at the annual military ball and has made trips to Lowell, Massachusetts, and Newport, Rhode Island.

Boston University is one of the three New England institutions whose R.O.T.C. units have received an "excellent" rating from the Federal government. That the value of R.O.T.C. training is recognized by the students themselves is illustrated by the following extract from The Syllabus, page 317, published by the Class of 1929:

"The course in Military Science is more than just a training of men in tactics in preparation for war. It is a splendid training for business in that it develops the clear-cut execution of orders, and helps in the building of character and leadership. It trains in the handling of men, and prepares the student for positions of responsibility in the outside world."

At present, the Boston University R.O.T.C. consists of 550 students.

The classwork of one hour per week consists of the following subjects for freshmen:

The National Defense Act

Military Courtesy

Military History

Military Hygiene and First Aid

Drill and Command

Rifle Marksmanship

Scouting and Patrolling

The classwork of one hour per week consists of the following subjects for sophomores:

Drill and Command

Musketry

Automatic Rifle

Scouting and Patrolling

Combat Principles

Map reading

Class sections are small, never exceeding fifteen students. There is more discussion and less lecturing than takes place in the average college classroom. Students are graded in classwork by the instructors and in drill by the upperclassmen.

Students who show exceptional ability are permitted to enroll in the R.O.T.C. Advanced Course. The students selected for the course (about 50% of the applicants are accepted) sign a contract to take 5 hours a week of Military Science during their junior and senior years of college, for which 3 hours credit is given. They also agree to attend a summer camp of six weeks' duration at the close of the junior year in college.

The Advanced Course student is a cadet officer in command of a platoon of 35 students or a company of 75 students. This gives the cadet officer an exceptional opportunity to develop his leadership ability. Upon completing the four-year course,

he is appointed a second lieutenant in the Officers' Reserve Corps.

Classwork in the junior year:

Map Reading and Military Sketching

Drill and Command

Machine Guns

37 Millimeter Gun

3-inch Trench Mortar

Combat Principles

Classwork in the senior year:

Military Law

Military History and Policy

Administration

Field Engineering

Drill and Command

Combat Principles

The R.O.T.C. Manual of four volumes is the prescribed text, supplemented by maps and history textbooks. Throughout the four-year course, emphasis is placed upon development of leadership and character. To quote paragraph 93, Rules and Regulations for the Boston University R.O.T.C:

"The advanced course of the R.O.T.C. is given with a view to fitting for leadership such students as are permitted to take it. The course enables each student to function as a cadet officer for a period of two years.

"During this period he is put in command of other students and is presented with an opportunity to learn how to control others, an opportunity to practice and perfect his ability to direct the effort of others, an opportunity to fit himself for

leadership in later life."

A Typical High School Unit.

R.O.T.C. Units in public high schools are similar to those in colleges, due allowance being made for the youth of the students. Let us examine a typical unit, the one at Gloucester High School. All sophomores, juniors, and seniors are enrolled in the R.O.T.C., which has a total of 305 boys at present. Two hours of credit are given for three hours of military work (1 hour of class and 2 hours of drill) per week. The subjects taught to Boston University freshmen and sophomores are spread over a three year period at Gloucester High School.

"The ROTC is given whole hearted support by school authorities, townspeople, and students themselves. Gloucester has maintained a high school battalion for over 40 years, and upon the creation of the R.O.T.C. immediately applied for a Unit. It is the only high school R.O.T.C. Unit in the country which has had the honor of being awarded "Honor High School" rating by the War Department for 10 consecutive years, ever since its establishment."" (Lt. Col. A. T. Dalton, Military Instructor at Gloucester High School, in a letter dated January 12, 1931)

In addition to the high schools and colleges, many military academies have established R.O.T.C. units since the passage of the National Defense Act. Although a few of these essentially military schools are of collegiate grade, such as Norwich University and the Virginia Military Institute, the majority are secondary schools, like Culver, Staunton, and the New York Military Academy. These schools maintain high standards of academic work in order to prepare boys for college. Culver's curriculum has recently been revised by a faculty committee from the Harvard School of Education.

The technical military training necessary, must, of course,

occupy a place subordinate to the class work.

"The military mode of life during the high-school age is designed to initiate boys into such a program of daily life that they may develop habits of orderliness, application and concentration, for the purpose of making intellectual and vocational pursuits possible and so as to improve social adjustment." (Prof. M. V. O'Shea, "The Nation's Schools," Vol II, No. 3, page 4)

III Other Types of Military Training.

Besides the R.O.T.C. units at schools and colleges, there are 60 government-aided military units, most of which are found in public high schools and private preparatory schools. Although the War Department furnishes uniforms and equipment, the instructors are not necessarily Regular Army officers. In some institutions , a faculty member with military experience conducts drill. Usually, these institutions do not offer Military Science classwork - simply close order drill and calisthenics.

Wakefield High School, for example, has a government aided unit of about 150 boys, who drill 3 hours per week. The instructor is a retired technical sergeant of the Regular Army.

In addition to the R.O.T.C. units and the Government-aided units, there are cadet corps in about 100 high schools in the United States. In every case, the expense is borne by the city. The instructors are usually reserve officers employed by the school committee. In some cases, however, the instruction is conducted by academic teachers who have had military experience. The city furnishes rifles, but the boys are usually required to buy their own uniforms.

Let us examine a few of these high school organizations.

"Taunton has had military drill in its high school for a long period of years. Membership in the cadets is optional. It has always been very popular and a considerable portion of our boys are represented. We have, at the present time, a batallion of four companies. The success of the organization has been largely due to our very able instructor, Major Norris O. Danforth

who taught the fathers of some of the present cadets. We think very highly of the system here. It is effective in discipline, and promotes a carriage among the boys which is obtained in no other way, even through athletics. I have never felt that the promotion of a military spirit through such course of instruction, was an impressive argument against it." (Wendell A. Mowry, Superintendent of Schools, Taunton, Mass., in a letter dated February 10, 1931)

Some schools have discontinued their military drill, due to causes which I shall discuss in the next section of this thesis.

"I have had no military service other than in the Salem High School, from which I graduated in 1876. I was very sorry when military training was given up in our high school. I think it is a great loss to our young people in many ways." (G. Arthur Bodwell, member of the Salem City Council, in a letter dated January 26, 1931)

Portland, Maine, has had drill in its public high schools since 1879.

"Military training in the Portland schools is optional. Freshmen and sophomores are privileged to take their choice of gymnasium work or military training, but must take one or the other for the first two years in high school. As the Cadet Corps here is not part of the Junior R.O.T.C., it has no regular army personnel attached for training purposes. It is under the direction of a Reserve Officer who conducts regular drills and has full supervision of this activity. Military training in reality is a part of the physical training program of the Portland high schools. The scope of the training covers

close-order drill and ceremonies, and the subject of military tactics is not taught at all. The aim of the work is to improve body posture and to improve coordination of mind and body, to inculcate obedience to orders and develop leadership.

"The Corps consists of four companies completely organized with officers and non-commissioned officers. The drills are conducted by the cadet officers who are held responsible for the discipline and perfection of drill. These officers function with full authority and develop into leaders of others and the experience thus gained makes them more confident of themselves in their conduct with others.

"Teachers in the high schools advise me that members of the Cadet Corps are more amenable to authority and more prompt in following directions than the average pupil without such training. I believe that military training is responsible for a greater degree of respect for authority and tends to make prompt response to instruction a matter of habit." (Karl V. Palmer, Military Instructor, Portland High Schools in a letter dated February 11, 1931)

Boston has the largest high school cadet corps in the United States, with an enrollment of 18,000 boys. The city employs National Guard and reserve officers, most of whom are college graduates, as instructors of military drill. The following articles describe adequately the Boston system, with comments by a former governor and by the present superintendent of schools:

"Military drill is a tradition in the public schools of

Boston," says Superintendent Burke, who gives in some detail its history as related to the curriculum in this city, and he comes to the conclusion that as a result of his observation, military drill as directed and controlled by our local authorities of schools is "altogether commendable " and that "its discontinuance would be ill advised and decidedly regrettable."

Mr. Burke says in part:

"It is needless to remark that military drill, as conducted in the high schools of Boston, is not promotive of war spirit and has never savored of militarism. From the beginning it has been under the exclusive control of the school committee and has never been identified with any State or federal organization

"Military drill is an inexpensive form of physical training. It is attractive to boys and appeals strongly to boys' natures.....It teaches the boy how to serve and likewise how to lead; essential qualities in a democratic society."

"Mr. Burke recently asked the opinions of all head masters of high schools in Boston, where military drill is given, as to the value of the drill so far as it relates to the intellectual, physical, and moral training of boys.

"All heads to whom this inquiry was addressed," says the report, "have submitted replies, expressing very frankly their views on the subject. One headmaster apparently questions the effectiveness of military instruction, another headmaster, while favoring the drill in general, presents certain criticisms for improvement. The remaining headmasters, nine in number, are unqualifiedly in approval."

"In another part of his report, under the caption 'Training of the Emotions,' Superintendent Burke deals at length with the training in character and for citizenship and quotes from reports made to him by various principals, showing the methods employed in building up character in the individual pupils that will function later in life in good citizenship." (Boston Post, June, 1926)

"What is construed as being one of the strongest arguments for military training in the high schools--a question which has been made the subject of a bitter controversy by the so-called professional pacifists--was voluntarily set forth by Governor Fuller today, after he had reviewed the parade of the fourteen regiments of Boston High School Cadets, with 8,000 in line, representing twenty-five schools.

"Governor Fuller, thrilled by the spectacle, immediately sent a large box of roses to Lieutenant Colonel Charles A. Ranlett, junior master commanding the Boston school cadets, together with a letter setting forth his impressions of the parade and of its significance."

His letter follows:

"Please accept my hearty congratulations on the fine, manly, soldierly appearance of the schoolboy battalions of Boston as they passed the State House today. It was a thrilling sight to see Young America marching by to martial tunes under the starry banner of the Republic.

"These boys created a splendid, manly appearance, and I am sure they have learned the need of discipline and have absorbed the need of a spirit of co-operation, both attributes of inestimable value to them in all the affairs of life. I

can well imagine these young soldiers as guarantees of peace, and yet willing and prepared to serve their country in the hour of need.

"Extend to them, please, my congratulations, and accept for yourself these roses with my best wishes and kindest personal regards." (Boston Transcript, June, 1926)

"NOTES ON MILITARY DRILL IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS:-

(Prepared for Brig. Gen. John H. Agnew at request of Col. George S. Penney)

"1. What properly conducted drill will teach boys:-

(a) Good posture: A certain proportion of the time must be devoted to drill in the free standing exercises prescribed in physical training (T.R.) of the Army, formerly known as the 'Manual of Physical Training.' Proper poise in walking and planting the feet is a routine part of marching. Most of all it is the inspirational element in military drill, which no other kind of exercise includes, which impels a boy to want to hold himself erect and in an upright manly position.

(b) Co-Ordination: No gymnasium exercise except the advanced and difficult elements of military gymnastics such as fencing, equal the correct execution of the manual of arms for the cultivation of body coordination. Not only that, but drill in the manual requires a mental activity that few gymnasium exercises include.

(c) Co-Operation: (team work): Military drill is perfect team work, perfectly exemplified when well done. The boy must cooperate absolutely to do his part in making the group to which he belongs (the team) a good one. This requires full development of the idea of self devotion. In a gymnasium class the inspirational element is entirely lacking. Each is for himself; to make himself better muscled, more elastic, a better athlete. In a military company each is for all; to make himself as good as possible, not alone for his own advantage but for the

betterment of the group.

(d) Mental Activity: The keen attention required at drill sharpens the mental acumen. No one in ranks knows just what is to happen next. The number of things that may be ordered are legion. The officer snaps out a command and it is instantly obeyed. The brain of every boy must be alert and responsive.

(e) Discipline: The habit if implicit and immediate obedience is a mere incidental of properly taught drill. It should be, and it can be, made the backbone of the discipline of a school. Where it has not done this, it has in every case that I know of, been the fault of the teacher, that is, the drill has not been rightly taught. It has, in such cases, been in the hands of untrained or half-trained teachers. A real officer, imbued with a proper sense of discipline himself, will teach his boys respect for authority and some of the reverence for higher things that is so sadly lacking in many of the boys of today. In schools where drill has not existed and where it has been introduced, in the hands of good instructors, class room teachers have told me over and over what a change for the better they soon noticed in their classes. The boy that formerly slouched over his desk as he stood up to recite would stand up on his feet instead and show a finer "morale" in all his bearing. Note, however, the great importance of selecting an officer who is fully competent to teach. He should have a good general background of education himself to that in a school he will always have a comprehensive understanding of the pedagogical problems of the teachers and master.

He must know how to make his department a help to the whole school. In Boston we regard the giving of cadet rank to the upper class boys as a public honor, and the established rule is that no unworthy boy can hold office. It is clearly understood that if a boy gets a bad conduct mark for a monthly period he has automatically forfeited his cadet rank, if he holds such. Falling below a certain minimum standard in his academic rank for two mark-periods in succession also causes automatic forfeiture of cadet rank. On the whole this has had a very beneficial effect in the schools of Boston, tending to raise the standard of work both academically and in the drill. Generally speaking it is the boy with the 'most gray matter' in his head that makes the best cadet officer.

(f) Loyalty and Patroitism: A fine military unit is an inspiration to its members. Every soldier knows that. Boys marching in well organized companies and regiments, with their own fine field music and their splendid colors in the ranks experience an influence that I do not believe any possible element of purely physical training can parallel. I have seen and been a part of some great physical training demonstrations. I taught physical training for years, functioned at one time or another at the Harvard Summer School, Posse Gymnasium, Sargent School, and others. I know of no material or psychological influence in pure training that equals the character building effect of the inspiration that is to be found in the march and maneuver of troops. Last June I had the honor to lead the Boston school boys again in their

annual street parade, and I can assure you that as I saw company after company pass with eyes right, every face upraised with pride, till nearly eighteen thousand had passed, I felt a thrill of pride in the belief that these boys are an element that our country can depend on in the emergencies that may arise in the future.

2. Advantage or Disadvantage of R.O.T.C. as contrasted with the Boston School Cadet System:

(a) R.O.T.C. takes only boys over 14 years of age and of a certain physical standard. The result is that if it is proposed to have the work done in regular school hours, classes will be broken up and the Head Master is confronted with the difficult school interior problem of supervising and assigning the members of the divisions, part of whom go to drill and part of whom do not. The War Department requires 2 full hour periods per week for three years, or 3 full hour periods per week for two years. These do not readily meet with the period schedule of the traditional high school. In some cases the War Department has been willing to make some concessions, but the tendency is at present in the opposite direction. No one will question for a moment that the instruction given by the Regular Army R.O.T.C. officer and non-commissioned officers is excellent, but they start out at the begining with accepting only the best physical specimens in a school. In Boston we require every boy to drill, unless physically incapacitated, and it is often the undersized and partly deficient boy who develops most and who gains the most benefit from the drill.

One great R.O.T.C. advantage is that the War Department faces the whole expense. If the unit offered is large enough an efficient group of regular officers and enlisted men will be stationed at the school, with no salary expenses to the town or city. Full equipment and clothing will be provided and issued. You may depend upon it the work will be well done and the unit will be a source of pride to the school.

(b) The Boston School Cadet system takes every high school boy, no matter what his age, and it includes many of 13 and 13 1/2 years, and places them in companies suitable to their size and development. Each boy has two regular school class periods of drill per week for the four years that he is in high school. To meet the problem of the smaller youths we use several types of light-weight guns. Our so-called "Trench Rifle" for the smallest boys weighs but 3 1/2 pounds, and the intermediate size gun or the "U.S. Training Rifle" a perfect light-weight model of the U.S. Magazine Rifle, Model 1903, 6 lbs. Our system costs the city some money. An instructor starts at $2160.00 per year and his pay increases by increment and may reach $3888.00 maximum. These drill guns cost from $3.75 to $6.50 a piece in wholesale lots. Standard Regimental National Colors cost approximately $40.00, regimental colors the same. The installation of gunracks in the school gymnasium is an initial variable cost. Band instruments are very expensive. In the Boston organization we have full regimental bands in all the larger schools. The smaller schools are still content with the regimental drum and bugle corps. The full equipment for a bugle and

drum corps with the U. S. Army standard of instruments, slings, etc., for a strength of 16 buglers, 12 drummers, one bass drum, cymbals, drum major's baton, etc., will be $420.00. Suppose you wished to launch a cadet regiment of, say, 12 cadet companies (of only 40 boys each, enough for the immature voice of a young cadet captain) and with a bugle and drum corps as above; equip eight of the companies with the larger rifles and four of them with the lightest. In round numbers the expense of equipment would be $3300.00. That includes colors and slings, standard web belts, etc. I cannot give an accurate figure on the cost of installing gunracks. It varies so much according to local conditions. Often-times some local carpenter or builder can give a much better figure than the cost of standard gunracks. In addition to the cost of hiring a good military instructor, a military musical teacher should be obtained for two periods per week to handle the bugle and drum corps. There are plenty of efficient men to answer this requirement in the National Guard bands. I have been asked: 'What would be the initial cost of establishing military drill, following the Boston system, in a school of 1200 boys?' Roughly speaking it would be $6,700.00. This is making allowance for two cadet regiments of 600 men each, having each a bugle and drum corps. It allows, too, for some reduction of individual price on guns, which would be easily obtained in an order for so large a lot.

The greatest argument in favor of the Boston system

as against the R.O.T.C. system is to be found in the fact that control of the course is retained in the hands of your own authorities. The R.O.T.C. is frankly "Military Training." The Boston drill system takes the best of military elements and makes use of them educationally without undue emphasis on the combative elements."

Charles A. Ranlett,
Lt. Col., 376th Inf. (Res.)
Lt. Col., Mass. Nat. Guard, Ret.
Junior Master, Mil. Drill, Boston

IV The Extent and Status of Military Training at the Present Time.

1. Ninety colleges and universities have compulsory military training, with an enrollment of 75,441 students.

2. Thirty six colleges and universities have elective military training, with an enrollment of 11,295 students.

3. Twenty five public high schools have compulsory military training, with an enrollment of 10,335.

4. Thirty three public high schools have elective military training, with an enrollment of 23,784 students.

5. Forty four military academies and preparatory schools have military training, with an enrollment of 9,103 students.

The above statistics refer to units of the R.O.T.C., as maintained by the government on January 1, 1930, according to the Annual Report of the Secretary of War.

In addition to the R.O.T.C., there are 60 institutions which maintain government aided units, with an enrollment of 15,944, as provided by Section "55c" of the National Defense Act.

The total number of instutions maintaining either R.O.T.C. or "55c" units is 288, with a total enrollment of 145,902 throughout the United States, Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines.

In order to ascertain the status of military training at the present time, let us turn first to the colleges. There are almost 500,000 male college students in the United States and its dependencies. Of this number, 86,736 are enrolled in the R.O.T.C. As approximately one sixth of the male college students of the nation are members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps,

we see that military training has a fairly secure place in the colleges and universities. This is especially true in the Land-Grant colleges, which have had military training for almost seventy years.

It goes without saying that the success of the R.O.T.C. is due largely to the favorable attitude of college students and faculties. The opinions of educators are fully discussed in another section of this thesis, but this seems to be a proper place to mention the matter of student opinion.

Although the University of Florida "Alligator" inquires editorially why college students are "made to swath themselves in inane clothing and lug around dummy guns like a bunch of ninnies," student opinion throughout the country endorses military training.

C. M. Mason, student editor of the "Lode," published at the Michigan College of Mining and Technology, states that the staff of his paper is "heartily in favor of all of the R.O.T.C. work and has observed the benefit that it has rendered both to the students in it and to the college as a whole."

B. S. Patterson, University of Chicago '28, former cadet major at the institution, declared:

"Student opinion at the University of Chicago is very much in favor of military training and the R.O.T.C. Should the question be put to a vote, the result undoubtedly would be decidedly favorable to the continuance of Chicago's part in the R. O. T. C.

"The slow but constant increase in the enrollment of the

University of Chicage unit may be taken as a definite proof of favorable student opinion." (National Defense Magazine, February, 1928, page 4)

"Military Science courses give opportunity for leadership practice and group co-operation that no other course can offer.

"Military training of the proper sort develops character by demanding exactitude, promptness, and respect for authority; excellent traits for a business man or any good citizen."

The popularity of military training led to the establishment of the National Society of Scabbard and Blade in 1905. The purposes of this honorary society are "to unite in closer relationship the military departments of American Universities and Colleges; to preserve and develop the essential qualities of good and efficient officers; to prepare ourselves as educated men to take a more active part and to have a greater influence in the military affairs of the communities in which we may reside and above all to spread intelligent information concerning the military requirements of our country."

There are several other military societies in colleges, among which Mortar and Ball and the Pershing Rifles are the best known.

The War Department has always maintained a policy of close cooperation with the officials of the colleges and universities.

"Civilian heads of educational institutions in which units of the R.O.T.C. are established will retain the general authority of supervision and control over the department of

military science and tactics which they ordinarily exercise over other departments of the institution.

"The daily instruction periods should be coordinated with the college schedule and correspond to the hours of the other departments.

"Every effort will be made to secure cooperation between the department of military science and tactics and the other departments of the institution." (Army Regulations 145-10, paragraphs 17, 51, 56)

The Regular Army officers detailed for R.O.T.C. duty enter wholeheartedly into the life of the university, frequently coaching athletics in addition to their military work. That the friendliest relations exist between the students, professors, and military instructors is clearly shown by the following opinions of college administrators:

"The influence of the Army officers on the students is wholesome in every respect." (President Thomas, Pennsylvania State College)

"The Army officers detailed here are an invaluable asset in the training and education of the young men of Florida." (President Murphree, University of Florida)

"These officers are not unwelcome representatives of an outside agency, merely tolerated for the sake of appearances; they are really part of our educational family, one of our regularly constituted and accredited departments." (Dean C. S. Boucher, University of Chicago)

Another factor making for the success of the R.O.T.C. is the policy of carefully selecting upperclassmen for the

Advanced Course. Students of good character, personality and leadership ability are the only ones permitted to enroll in the course.

"To be admitted to an advanced unit at Technology, a man must have the approval of the Military Science Department, whose approval would naturally be received had the man received and completed the two years basic training. In addition to this approval he has to have the approval of the Head of the Department in which he is enrolled as a student and the Head of this Department is instructed not to approve any applicant for the R.O.T.C. unless the man ranks academically in the upper half of the class and unless in the judgment of the Head of the Department the man is of the proper type to make a good officer; by type, I mean, has the personality which will command the respect of his classmates and the public in general." (Professor Edward F. Miller, Head of the Mechanical Engineering Department, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in a letter dated January 26, 1931)

The status of military training in secondary schools is considerably different from that in the colleges and universities. In addition to the 44 military academies and preparatory schools which maintain R.O.T.C. Units, there are 58 public high schools which do so. There are approximately 50 public high schools which maintain government-aided military units and less than 100 high schools which have cadet organizations not connected with the War Department.

Of the 14,000 public high schools in the United States, there are less than 200 which have some form of military training. The reasons for this are:

1. The indifference or opposition of educators.

2. The opposition of physical training instructors who fear competition.

3. The fact that four-fifths of the high schools in the United States have an enrollment of less than 50 boys.

4. Unhappy experiences with poorly trained military instructors.

5. Expense.

The first reason is the indifference of educators; that is, superintendents and high school principals. The best discussion of this point is contained in "The Infantry Journal," May, 1929, an article by by W. T. Gibbs, entitled "Military Training of the School Boy and His Later Life." Gibbs says, in part:

"Two of the principal authorities to whom we turn for high school objectives are Professor Inglis of Harvard University, and the Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education. Professor Inglis places upon the school the responsibility for training in 'social civic' activities, and the Cardinal Principles, those for health and citizenship. But it is clear that they do not rate military training very highly for contributing thereto, for the former includes it as a special and limited possibility; the latter makes no mention of it.

"Let us pass now to a consideration of some of our schools that offer drill. To what extent is this general learning situation altered thereby? Training is merely offered for those who want it, or perhaps because the school is receiving an appropriation or a gift which makes such training one of its conditions.

"Hence no boy who meets the requirements will be 'denied,' but he must not allow it to 'interfere' with his regular work, nor must it disturb the peace and quiet of the grounds and buildings. These boys, therefore, must hold their exercises at noon or after school; or possibly they may be permitted to go into the streets and parks. Under such conditions, it is not hard to see why the response of the ordinary school boy to drill will be one of avoidance."

On the other hand, a high school principal who firmly believes that military training is a worthwhile activity will do everything possible to encourage the work of the cadet corps. It is preferable that drill be conducted during "business hours," on the regular block schedule, instead of being crowded into the late afternoon hours.

Methods of awarding credit differ in various high schools. As there is no outside study required, military drill should not receive full credit. It is, of course, on much the same basis as gymnasium work.

The opposition of physical instructors to military drill will be discussed at length in part seven of this thesis. Reason number 3 is self-explanatory; it is impossible to conduct military training in a small rural high school.

Before the war, some high school principals, desirous of establishing military drill in their schools, naturally turned to the local military "expert," a local National Guard officer of limited education and experience. With all due respect to the present National Guard, I wish to point out that pre-war National Guard or militia officers were frequently local pol-

iticians, selected for their popularity rather than for their military efficiency. Lacking both military and educational qualifications, these officers were so unsuccessful in their work as military instructors in high schools that, in many cases, drill was abolished.

A military instructor should be the intellectual equal of the academic teachers at the school, he should possess excellent character and personality, and he should understand modern Regular Army methods of instruction.

The fifth reason - expense - is an important one. There should be a smooth field or playground upon which to drill; for indoor work during the winter months there should be a drill-hall, gymnasium, or armory. Rifles, real ones or wooden dummies, must be provided, and the matter of uniforms runs into considerable expense. In the Boston high schools, boys are required to buy their own uniforms at $7.50, while the uniform of a cadet officer is even more expensive. This is quite a hardship on boys who come from poor families. The financial problem of military training has already been fully discussed in Col. Ranlett's article previously quoted. In the case of a junior R.O.T.C., the expense is borne by the federal government, but the extension of the R.O.T.C. itself is seriously hampered by lack of Congressional appropriations. It does seem to the writer, however, that the average community can afford to support a high school military unit without incurring heavy expenses.

The controversy about <u>compulsory</u> training has had an important effect upon the status of military training at the present time.

Much of the pacifist objection to the compulsory feature is insincere. If I knew a clearer way to state that, I should use that way. The pacifists talk a great deal about "forcing" a young man to take military training against his will; they use the word "compulsory" as a smoke screen, but in reality are opposed to all military training. "Required" is a better word than "compulsory," by the way.

"The removal of military training from high schools, and of its compulsory feature from the colleges, is a minimum program for dealing with the R.O.T.C." (Foreward to Military Training in Schools and Colleges," by Winthrop D. Lane)

In other words, the first step is to make military training optional, the next step is to do away with it altogether. This is the general scheme of the opponents of "compulsory" training.

In 1926, the Wickersham report on military training, similar in some respects to the Wickersham report on Prohibition, was published. This report, which discussed, among other things, the "compulsory" doctrine, was commented upon as follows in the December 1926, Bulletin of the Military Order of the World War:

"The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America has recently issued a pamphlet on 'Military Training in Schools and Colleges.'" Its foreward, signed by George W. Wickersham, Chairman, and Sidney L. Gulick, Secretary, indicates that the pamphlet is the result of "numerous inquiries from constituent denominational committees and boards in regard to the agitation in many parts of our land over the Military Training now given in connection with the Reserve Officers' Training Corps as conducted in civilian educational institutions."

The foreward further states: "In presenting this pamphlet the Commission is not making any pronouncement on the question of military schools, public or private, on that of voluntary Military training in universities and colleges, or on that of the Citizens' Military Training Camps....It does raise the question of compulsory training in civilian institutions and of technical Military training in high schools." It still further states that "the Commission recognizes the necessity for a reasonable national defense and for maintaining internal order and international justice."

"Those statements are fair, reasonable, and possibly have been subscribed in all honesty of purpose and intent, but, the fact still remains that the real motive behind the activity against military training (whether the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America recognize it or not) hasn't much to do, actually,with the compulsory feature of it; but on the contrary is an activity against all military training, the word 'compulsory' being nothing more nor less than a nicely camouflaged excuse.

"Attention is invited to that sentence in the foreward reading 'in presenting this pamphlet, the Commission is not making any pronouncement on the question of military schools, public or private, on that of voluntary Military training....' While this pamphlet in itself gave evidence of treating the subject under consideration in a fairly reasonable manner, there is another pamphlet, 'Military Training in Schools and Colleges,' by Winthrop D. Lane and sponsored by a self-appointed committee of over fifty, that presents a violent tirade against military training in general. In obtaining the pamphlet issued by the

Federal Council (for which 25 cents was paid), the Lane pamphlet was given away free at the same time and at the offices of the Federal Council, 105 East 22nd Street, New York. Therefore it is consistent to believe that in assisting to distribute the Lane pamphlet, the Federal Council of Churches conveys the impression that it is in sympathy at least with the purposes and objectives indicated in the Lane pamphlet. Otherwise it would not assist in the distribution of that unpatriotic, pacifistic and non-resistance piece of literature.

"Its author, Mr. Lane, is recorded in the official Lusk report. It places him as a member of the Free Political Prisoners Committee of the Peoples' Union, organized by a group of liberals, writers, and revolutionary Socialists and associated him with such individuals as Norman Thomas, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Harry W. Laidler and others. He was a member of the Intercollegiate Socialistic Society (now the League for Industrial Democracy), established to teach socialism among college students and the parent body of many 'liberal clubs' in universities and colleges.

"Naturally the Lane pamphlet, which, as noted before in this article is distributed free by the Federal Churches of Christ in America in connection with its own document on military training, does not go as far in the activity against military training as does the Lane booklet; but the spirit of 'helpfulness' is expressed if only in more nicely chosen words.

"Therefore, it is consistent to wonder and speculate as to just where the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America stands in this matter. Is it just trying to play the game of not letting the right hand know what the left hand is doing, as

might be the deduction in his handling of the Lane pamphlet on military training and knowing as it must know of the past and present performance of the editor and many on the committee who sponsor the document?"

There are many people (including some Army officers) who favor military training, but who do not believe in the doctrine of compulsion. The truth of the matter is that there is a wide divergence of opinion on the question of "compulsory" drill. I herewith present both sides of the story.

"We are told to abolish compulsory military training, because it develops the spirit of militarism and we are advised to abolish compulsory chapel because it fails to develop the spirit of religion. In other words, the compulsory element fails in the one case and succeeds in the other.

"With reference to those students who are unwilling to take military training, they should remember that there are certain things in life which all must do whether we want to or not. There are many things that we are all compelled to do for our own or the common good, which we would not do if we followed our own wills. Compulsion is a characteristic of life in organized society. Indeed, the opponents of military training are trying to compel us to abolish it. They would exercise compulsion to attain their purpose." (Dr. David Kinley, former President, University of Illinois, in "The National Defense Magazine" for November, 1927, page 32)

"Human nature being what it is, there are many otherwise capable men who, from laziness, selfishness, or indifference

to duty, would not voluntarily assume the burdens and hardships which go with military training. The only fair and genuinely American way is to make everybody bear his share of the burden, so long as he is physically or mentally able to do so." (Lt. Col. Wm. M. Mumm, in the "National Defense Magazine" for November, 1927, page 36)

"Refusing to allow either the militarists or the pacifists to dominate--believing that it would be equally foolish to force all of our studends to participate in military training or to refuse to allow any of them to have such training--we support a military unit on a voluntary basis." (Dean C. S. Boucher, University of Chicago, in the "National Defense Magazine" for February 1928, page 9)

"The most serious and perhaps the most effective objection from those outside the Land-Grant colleges has found expression against the compulsory idea. As a mere comment on the situation it will be recalled that when these colleges were organized the elective idea had not taken hold of American education. It first found expression in the University of Michigan under the advocacy of President James B. Angell. Later the idea was accepted and advocated by President Chas W. Eliot of Harvard and quite promptly throughout the entire country. From the passing of the act in 1862 and for some years thereafter the idea of the elective principle had no consideration whatever either in Congress, in states or in colleges. When the elective idea actually made its appearance it was confined to the junior and senior years and would have had no relation whatever to the military instruction as given in the Land-Grant colleges. Furthermore, the elective idea was an

effort to escape the rigidity of the fixed curriculum in classics and to open up the way for a free acceptance of science and a wider field for history, economics, and allied subjects. It is not quite relevant, therefore, to argue for the elimination of military science as a subject required of all students from a promise based on either the elective theory or the permissive interpretation of the phraseology of the act itself. If the objection to compulsory education in military tactics is to be sustained, it must be on other grounds and for other reasons.

"It may be well, in passing, to note that there is a widespread objection in certain circles to anything compulsory in modern education or modern life. The revolt of youth is on in other than military and educational circles. It is also well to recognize that the American College has never surrendered its right or privilege to insist upon certain requirements for its degrees. There is no prospect that the American College will ever recede from this position. Thus we have the doctrine of compulsion in the history of every institution of learning. The elective idea was believed to give the individual a wider range of choice in determining his education, but once that decision was reached the faculty insisted upon its requirements with just as much emphasis as it ever had done in the older fixed curriculum. The unsatisfactory experience with the free elective has led nearly all colleges and universities not to name specifically either particular subjects, groups of subjects, courses or groups of courses that must be pursued in a satisfactory manner as a condition

precedent to a degree. It may be well for us to understand that the college has not vacated its right to determine the courses of instruction open to and available for students. In every case, however limited the choice may be, the consequences of that choice must be accepted by the student. From this statement of the case the argument against the advanced courses in military science as a matter of compulsion falls to the ground. These courses, therefore, stand upon their merits or fall with their demerits. There is no compulsion in the upper year, not common to all other academic subjects." (Dr. W. O. Thompson, President Emeritus, Ohio State University, in an address delivered January 10, 1929)

"Compulsory military training is foreign to the genius of America." (Dr. Daniel L. Marsh, President of Boston University, in Annual Report for 1925-1926, page 26-28)

"That compulsory military training is an institution of more than fifty years' standing in many of our American Universities, he (Dr. Marsh) apparently forgets that a department of instruction that is 'foreign to the genius of America' should exist so long in American Universities and undergo a normal growth by voluntary action of university administrators in proportion to the growth in general population and in college enrollment, is a sad commentary on American higher education.

"As well say that the Australian Ballot is un-American, for it has been introduced and widely adopted since the beginning of compulsory military instruction in American universities. It may possibly appear that it is now from a half to three

quarters of a century too late to attack compulsory military training in America." (Merritt M. Chambers, "Every Man A Brick, the Status of Military Training in American Universities," pages 47, 48)

"Placing all military instruction at the schools and colleges with R. O. T. C. units on a voluntary basis.....will give to work in Military Science a dignity and broad value which, while compulsory, it can never obtain." (Clarence C. Little, "The Awakening College" page 133)

With the last-quoted opinion, I am inclined to agree. I have had four years of compulsory military drill at English High School and four years of optional military training at Boston University. Frankly, I see no reason why military training in colleges should be compulsory.

Military training appeals so strongly to the highest type of college students that it can stand squarely on its own feet, without being bolstered up by artificial means. In my opinion, it is the right of the university authorities to make military training compulsory, but by so doing they make the student attitude toward the R.O.T.C. one of avoidance and dislike. Compulsory military training is logical but not psychological, in the writer's opinion.

In 1926 President Marsh made military training at Boston University optional instead of compulsory. The result has been a slight decrease in the size of the R.O.T.C. battalion, but a tremendous increase in the spirit and efficiency of the unit, --such an increase, in fact, that the unit has twice received

Boston University
School of Education
Library

an "excellent" rating from the government.

So far as the War Department is concerned, it is optional with the authorities of the school or college as to whether or not military training shall be compulsory. Some states have laws dealing with the subject, that is, prescribing that the training be compulsory at the state university.

As far as the public high schools are concerned, the details are left to the local authorities. According to the general laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

"The exercises of the public school may include calisthenics, gymnastics, and military drill, but no pupil shall be required to take any part in any military exercise if his parent or guardian is of any religious denomination conscientiously opposed to bearing arms, or is himself so opposed and the school committee is so notified in writing."

I am unable to form an opinion as to whether or not high school drill should be compulsory.

As a general rule, high school boys do not have the same critical attitude toward the curriculum that college students do. As a rule, adolescent boys look upon military drill as an activity similar to athletics, instead of as burden. For reasons which are really psychological, high school drill may be made compulsory without lowering the morale of the boys. It is a question to be determined by local conditions.

The status of military training in American schools and colleges has not been seriously affected by pacifist agitation against the R.O.T.C. Although military training has been abolished at Cleveland High School, Minneapolis High School, the

University of Manila and Northwestern University, it is increasing, rather than decreasing, throughout the United States.

At present there are four bills in Congress, the enactment of any one of which would greatly curtail military training in the schools of the country. The enactment of this group of bills would virtually destroy such training.

H. R. 15275, by Mr. Sinclair of North Dakota, December 16, 1930 (by request) would amend Sections 40 and 55c of the National Defense Act, as follows:

> Sec. 40. by causing the present language "two years elective or compulsory course of military training as a minimum for its physically fit male students, which course, when entered upon by any student, shall, as regards such student, be a prerequisite for graduation unless, etc." to read, "two years elective AND NOT compulsory, NOR, course of military training as a minimum, etc."
>
> Sec. 55c by causing the language "two years elective or compulsory" to read, "two years elective AND NOT compulsory, etc."

Were this bill to be enacted into law it would automatically nullify the authorization of the President to establish and maintain units of the R.O.T.C. in any school in which military training is compulsory, and in all schools carrying on "elective" course of training in which students are required to complete such course as a prerequisite to graduation.

H. R. 14058, by Mr. Welsh of Pennsylvania, December 2, 1930, would amend Sec. 40 of the National Defense Act in such manner as to provide:

"That no officer of the United States Army or any other per-

son in the employ of the United States shall teach any course of military training in any university, college, school, or other educational institution, other than essentially military schools, if such institutions require any student to pursue such course as a prerequisite for graduation or for any other reason."

This bill, if enacted, would accomplish the objects of the Sinclair Bill, but in a different manner, viz.: that of preventing any and all manner and form of required military training under the control of the War Department, by the withdrawal of Army instructors.

H. R. 15422, by Mr. Browne of Wisconsin, December 18, 1930, would also amend Secs. 40. and 55c of the Defense Act, by expressly eliminating all "junior divisions" at "other than essentially military schools," thus doing away with such divisions in all high schools and other preparatory institutions.

S. 5447, by Mr. Brookhart, of Iowa, December 19, 1930, is another bill to amend Secs. 40. and 55c, which if enacted would make all military training "elective and not compulsory." This bill is very similar in language and the same in effect as H. R. 15275 by Mr. Sinclair of North Dakota. It is interesting to note Mr. Sinclair's bill was introduced December 16, and that of Mr. Brookhart December 19, and both by "REQUEST."

The constituent organizations of the Federal Council of Churches met at Evanston, Illinois, February 25-27, 1930, as a "Study Conference," where resolutions were adopted, scathingly denouncing military training; pledging the support and cooperation of the churches to the Committee on Militarism in

Education, and providing for the AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT along the lines of the above bills. None of these bills have any chance of passing Congress.

A similar bill in the Massachusetts State Legislature has been defeated.

"SENATE OF
THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
STATE HOUSE, BOSTON

January
Twenty-eighth
1931

"Henry O. Kelley
Dorchester
Massachusetts

"Dear Sir:

"Senator Bacon directs me to acknowledge your letter of the 23d and to advise that there was no record made of the proceedings before the Committee on Education on the bill to abolish compulsory military drill. The committee reported "leave to withdraw" and the report was accepted by both branches of the Legislature without debate.

Very truly yours,
E. W. Mason
Assistant to the
President."

CITY OF SALEM, MASSACHUSETTS

OFFICE OF CITY CLERK

January 24, 1931

At a meeting of the City Council held on January 22nd, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted, and approved by the Mayor on January 24th:

WHEREAS, the national security of the United States is menaced as never before in the history of this country by a concerted effort on the part of ultra-pacifists, atheists and radicals working under orders from Soviet Russia, by attempting to curtail and abolish military training, known as the Reserved Officers Training Corps, in our schools and colleges,

RESOLVED: that the United States Senators from Massachusetts and the Representative in Congress from this district be requested to oppose any curtailment of the present National Defense Act, which provides for military training in our educational institutions, and any reduction in the Congressional appropriation for R. O. T. C. activities,

AND FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Senator and Representatives to the General Court of Massachusetts from this district be requested to oppose any bills introduced into the Massachusetts Legislature which seek to abolish or amend the existing law, as regards military training in the schools of Massachusetts.

Attest:-

John J. Connelly
City Clerk

V Study of Arguments for Military Training as found in catalogues of Military Schools.

"Military discipline has prevailed from the beginning and no old De Veaux boy wishes that it had been otherwise. De Veauxnians think there is no better method of teaching honor, order, accuracy, promptness, obedience and respect for one's superiors." (De Veaux Register, 1930-31, page 14) The De Veaux School, Niagara Falls, New York, was founded in 1852.

"Having found that discipline, the ideals of service, physical exercise, plain, wholesome living, regular habits, and sincere devotion to duty--things that are associated with the soldier--are equally beneficial to young men destined for civilian endeavors, certain schools have applied these principles, and have become known as military schools." (by Brig. Gen. L. R. Gignilliat)

"Everywhere today men are needed who have been trained to lead and who are able and willing to lead. And before a man can lead he must have learned to follow, to have respect for authority, to recognize the efficiency of concerted action, to appreciate the wisdom and justice of sublimating his personal inclinations and individual benefits for the good of the whole.

"I do not know of any suggestion that has been made for developing national leadership superior to or even equal to that which has been develpped in the past through military training." (Brig. Gen. Milton F. Davis)

"Under the military regime, everything must be done exactly on time and according to fixed standards. The uniforms must all be clean, every button must be in place and the clothes must fit the cadet acceptably, according to military style. Hands and face must be clean, hair combed, shoes brushed and linen immaculate. If there is any neglect or deficiency in these respects, a definite penalty is assigned.

"Psychologists and those who have made extensive research into adolescent training are fully cognizant that proper military training given to well educated boys will scareely bias their minds to extreme pacifism or extreme junkerism. This training will, however, develop straight-forwardness, self-reliance and an improved physical condition if it is taught with intelligence." (Dr. . V. O'Shea in "The Nation's Schools," Vol. II, No.4, October, 1928)

According to the Association of Military Colleges and Schools, military training serves:

"To develop initiative, self-control, self reliance
To secure punctuality, orderliness, efficiency
To give erect carriage and manly bearing
To develop the ability to think clearly and act promptly
To promote a high personal standard of honor."

"There is a phase of military training for young men, to which attention is especially invited, and that is the benefit to the individual himself. He learns self-discipline, hygiene, self-confidence, and has an opportunity to develop qualities of leadership, with an understanding of its re-

sponsibility. But above all, he is taught the principles of our Government and the obligations of citizenship. I would that every young man might have these advantages." (General Pershing)

"The military schools of this country make no pretense or pretext of trying to send their graduates to the military or naval service. Our object is to prepare boys for college or for the business world. The military life of our schools is simply the way boys live while they are undergoing this preparation, because we believe it gives a boy the best training on earth for leadership, citizenship, loyalty to country, and commercial life." (Gen. M. F. Davis, N. Y. Military Academy)

Several years ago, General William Verbeck, President of the Manlius School, read a paper entitled "The Ideal Military School" at the annual meeting of the Association of Military Colleges and Schools of the United States. The following extracts are of particular interest:

"The first requisites of the ideal military school must be that its processes must be simpler, the running of its machinery smoother, its discipline quieter and more dignified because of the infusion of military methods.

"The establishment of student government through cadet officers and non-commissioned officers tends to give real character to the military regime. The cadet officers, instead of being mere mouthpieces at drill and on mechanical maneuvers, soon learn to exercise real judgment, responsibility and initiative.

"Student government does not alone contemplate the availability of well trained and disciplined commissioned and non-commissioned officers, but also the acquiescence and approval of the whole student body in all measures making for good and healthy government.

"In the ideal military school the cadets are highly organized. There must be athletic teams, musical clubs and literary societies,--each group thoroughly organized.

"Responsibility and initiative should go hand in hand.

"The life of the ideal military school must be a cheerful optimistic one, on the theory that the happier the cadet, the harder he works and the better soldier he is.

"The necessity for punishment is reduced to a minimum in the ideal military school.

"Above all, however, building of character is the paramount purpose of the ideal military school. It aims to give him purpose and energy, and all incidents in the school life tend to the building up of noble character."

The catalogue of the Culver Military Academy says:

"Those who have studied the possibilities of the military system know that it is a most effective instrument for the training of boys if applied by competent and experienced men. Psychologists recognize the necessity of making automatic early in life as many useful habits as possible. The military system is an ideal instrument for the accomplishment of this purpose, provided, as before suggested, that it is scientifically applied. Good breeding is mainly a matter of automatic good manners. Efficiency is largely a matter

of economy of time and effort secured through making automatic those things which may be done in the same way day after day, so that they waste no energy by requiring conscious thought. To the accomplishment of such ends the pure machine-like feature of the military system is used at Culver, and no further. On the other hand, those phases of it which cultivate initiative and alertness are strongly emphasized."

Many civilians imagine that military schools are "hard-boiled," that the officers are unfriendly and unsympathetic toward the boys. Nothing could be further from the truth. The "slap on the back" intimacy is entirely absent, but genuine respect and fellowship exist between cadet and officer.

The academic standards of military schools are very high. As at West Point, the classes are small in order that every student may have the benefit of individual instruction. Military academies prepare for liberal arts colleges, technical colleges, and for business activity. The Culver Military Academy also offers courses in music and motors.

In addition to the military preparatory schools, there are ten military colleges, which grant degrees. Norwich University is the "West Point of New England," the military college of the State of Vermont. In addition to its academic work, Norwich maintains a splendid Cavalry R.O.T.C. Unit. Upon graduation, the cadets are commissioned as second lieutenants in the Officers' Reserve Corps. Honor graduates are eligible for Regular Army commissions.

VI Study of Opinions of Educators

"Our most eminent educators have agreed that aside from its physical benefits, time devoted to the military studies in the R.O.T.C. is fully entitled to credit in the general scheme of mental culture. The student of engineering will be a better civil engineer for having knowledge of the military application of his profession to the nation. In subjecting themselves to the discipline which is essential to military teamwork, young men still learn the real secret of modern civilization which depends upon the combined action of human beings to common ends." (The late John W. Weeks, U. S. Senator and Secretary of War)

There is, of course, no more unanimity of opinion among educators on the subject of military training than there is on any other matter concerning modern education. Those educators who have had actual contact with the R.O.T.C. are in favor of it; those who oppose military training base their conclusions largely upon hearsay evidence.

"Prominent educators who could not name a single subdivision of military science, and who have no knowledge of military training from personal experience have allowed themselves to be persuaded to express off-handed opinions to the effect that military training is barbaric, undemocratic, and otherwise undesirable. If these gentlemen could be prevailed upon to spend some time in a classroom in military science and to learn something of the body of knowledge with which a prospective military leader must

become familiar, it is possible that they would revise their off-hand opinion of the character, content and general value of military instruction. At any rate they should hesitate to make off-hand generalizations in this field without having any personal experience in it and without having even made any objective study of it." ("Every Man A Brick," page 57)

Let us study a few of the objections to military training and the answers to these objections, bringing out as far as possible the opinions of educators and other leaders of American life.

1. Military training is a mechanical process which stifles individual initiative and teaches blind obedience.

Mrs. Anna Garlin Spencer expressed this idea at the Conference of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, held in Washington in March, 1923.

"Theirs not to make reply,
Theirs not to reason why,
Theirs but to do or die," she orated, with all the fervor of a fifth grade school boy. "And that," she told her audience, "is what military training does for your boy. It makes of him an automaton. We want men and women who can 'reason why,' and we want to keep our Constitutional right to 'make reply'."

"While the discipline of obedience suffices for the soldier, the discipline required for civil life is vastly broader. Any program for youth that does not recognize and

use a thinking obedience is not educational, and it has no place in our public educational system." (Dr C. W. Hetherington as quoted in Senate Document #22, 65th Congress)

And the committee on Military Training of the Department of Superintendence, N. E. A., reported in 1917 that "the ideals of the kind of obedience and of general conduct aimed at by military exercises are best represented by the word 'martinet,' which these exercises long ago contributed to our educational vocabulary--ideals which every teacher who aims at real character-development, seeks to avoid."

Professor Sterling G. Brinkley of Emory University (School and Society, Vol. XXVI, No. 658, August 6, 1927) says:

"Blind unquestioning obedience to orders and authority which the individual has had no voice in deciding and setting up is a quality we do not want."

It is very unfortunate that so many civilians associate discipline with "blind obedience," punishments, court martials, and guardhouses. The proper definition of military discipline is "that mental attitude and state of training which render obedience and proper conduct instinctive under all conditions. It is founded upon respect for and loyalty to properly constituted authority." (Training Regulations 10-5, paragraph 3)

I have also heard discipline defined as "the state of mind which makes punishment unnecessary."

People who think of discipline as "blind" and "unthinking" have no conception of modern military methods.

"The old conception of the soldier as a blindly obedient automaton has been superseded by the ideal of a self-con-

trolled, intelligent soldier, who is impelled by his own conviction of the righteousness of his cause--who has the initiative and judgment to surmount difficulties, and who has supreme confidence in his ability to master any situation." (U.S. Army Studies in Citizenship, No. 2, pages 33,34)

"To many persons, discipline is a bugbear always associated with punishment and means the entire suffocation of individuality and initiative. Nothing could be farther from the true aim of real discipline or from the result of real discipline.

"Discipline means most assuredly that everyone moves cheerfully and with alacrity to carry out his chief's orders. But it does not mean unthinkingly. When a disciplined man gets an order, he <u>starts</u> thinking rather than stops.

"But instead of sitting down and figuring out that there are ten other things that his chief might much better have done at this time, he immediately starts thinking on how to best carry out his chief's orders, he bends all his efforts and drives his ingenuity to the limit in endeavoring to perform the allotted task in the quickest way, in the cheapest way, and in the way which will co-ordinate best with other tasks which are being performed simultaneously." (Major W. H. Wilbur, "The Koehler Method of Physical Drill," page 14)

The importance of discipline has been recognized for centuries.

"Order and discipline are the most important articles of an army; and without them, it is of no use." (Socrates)

"Discipline is the soul of armies." (Marshal Saxe)

"The major factor of true military discipline consists in securing the voluntary cooperation of subordinates." (Major General Lejeune, "Reminiscences of a Marine," page 463)

The fact is that the military system has been changed and is still being changed in the direction of development of individual initiative. It is, of course, true that an officer or soldier must obey the orders of his superiors, but within the limits imposed by their orders there is still a great field for the exercise of initiative. It is customary to tell a subordinate what to do, but not how to do it.

"Blind obedience, the belief that it is not his place to 'reason why,' is not characteristic of the best type of soldier. There is a reason, and a good reason, for every movement prescribed in the regulations. If the instructor will explain these reasons he will win the confidence and support of his men." (R.O.T.C. Manual, Volume I, page 218)

2. Military discipline is harsh and unreasonable.

"Army officers are not really fitted to train young boys, since they represent an atmosphere of sternness and formality which modern educational authorities avoid for adolescent students." (Report of the New York State Commission on Military Training for 1919, pages 9, 10)

Army officers do not represent an "atmosphere of sternness and formality." To begin with, the word "stern" is not used in the military profession today. There is discipline, of course, but it is not essentially "formal." Army officers do represent an atmosphere of "discipline and courtest which constitute a wholesome influence on the spirit of the student body," according to President Kane of the University of North Dakota. (Senate Committee Print, 67th Congress, 2nd Session)

"Our first objective in military science is to teach the student that obedience to lawful authority is not the badge of servitude but rather is it the indication of fitness to command, the mark of the leader, the brand of the thoroughbred." (Harry T. Matthews in "School and Society," January 21, 1928)

"Cheerful obedience to the orders of the officers and non-commissioned officers, regular attendance at all exercises, careful attention at drill and other duties, an honest endeavor to conform to all rules and regulations of the University and of the Department, and pride in the unit are the outward manifestations of the spirit and high

sense of duty which begets true discipline in the R.O.T.C." (Rules and Regulations for the Boston University R.O.T.C., page 24)

Is there anything harsh and unreasonable in the paragraph quoted above?

"With the right kind of men, commendation produces better results than censure. Therefore, if the squad executes some movement particularly well do not hesitate to tell them so. Let them know that you appreciate an honest effort, and they will put forth still greater effort.

"Patience is necessary, and the instructor who possesses plenty of it and never loses his temper, will have his men always trying to do their best for him.

"Be democratic, courteous, kindly and considerate of your men, but never familiar.

"The properly disciplined man is dependable, willing, prompt and consistent. He can be depended upon to execute his superior's commands, or to carry out his wishes even when he is not present."

The above extracts from the R.O.T.C. Manual, Vol. I, Chapter XXIX, show that there is a vast difference between 1931 military discipline and the kind of discipline which exists only in the imagination of the pacifists.

It is inconceivable that an officer should deliberately do anything to destroy the morale of his unit, for after all, spirit or morale is an important factor in building up any organization, civilian or military.

"Until labourers and employers perform the work of industry in the spirit in which soldiers perform that of an army, industry will never be moralized, and military life will remain what, in spite of the anti-social nature of its direct object, it has hitherto been, the chief school of moral co-operation." (John Stuart Mill, "Essay on Comte," 1865, page 149)

3. The obedience military drill teaches is not obedience in general but obedience to a Sam Browne belt.

The above opinion is frequently expressed by those opposed to military training. They are usually willing to admit that military drill teaches obedience and leadership, but do not feel that these qualities "carry over" into life activities. Educators who have come into contact with the R.O.T.C., however, are strongly of the opinion that the good habits inculcated in drill are of great value in later life.

President F. D. Farrell of the Kansas State Agricultural College believes that "the student who does his R.O.T.C. work in a satisfactory manner develops one of the most significant qualities--self control. In learning to control himself he meets the first requirement for control of others and so gets a good start toward effective leadership, not only in military affairs, but in all affairs involving the management of men."

"Success under the conditions of modern civilization

depends upon cooperative effort to a common end. In no other department than military training have we so good an opportunity to give this important element of an education." (President Brooks, University of Missouri)

"If you are some day called upon to command men, as the head of a great railway system or as the manager of a commercial organization, the discipline you are receiving in this regiment will be extremely valuable to you. Men who would command other men successfully should first of all learn how to obey successfully." (President Campbell, University of California)

"There are all too few opportunities in ordinary academic life to discipline youth in actual practice of leadership, and the R.O.T.C. provides an opportunity we will not willingly cancel." (Resolution of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges, November, 1926)

"The R.O.T.C. teaches men how to give and receive commands, how to obey, how to coordinate themselves with other men and to cooperate in the attainment of a given end. All these qualities are highly prized in every program of life. It is not essential to the question at issue to lay any claim to miliatry tactics as the supreme or exclusive agent in teaching these habits.....Modestly we affirm that the organizing ability of men well trained in military science is so obvious that education embodying these qualities needs little defense." (Dr. W. O. Thompson, President Emeritus, Ohio State University)

"The business man needs to know how to lead as well as to follow. The R.O.T.C. gives practical occasion for both

leading and following. We consider it fully as important as English and mathematics and economics and foreign language and history." (Dean Everett W. Lord, College of Business Administration, Boston University)

Not only educators, but engineers and business executives believe that military training is valuable preparation for life.

"It is my feeling that employers do attach quite a little value to the military training, not so much perhaps because of its warlike features but because of its value in developing qualities of leadership and control of men. The real point of interest to the employer is the character of the work done by the men in the military organization rather than mere participation in the training." (Frank L. Locke, Personnel Director, Division of Industrial Co-operation and Research, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in a letter dated January 24, 1931)

"It is generally understood now by the personnel officers who come here from the different firms who are seeking to employ our graduates, that the men in uniform are picked men and are given generally first choice. There are some people who will not hire a man unless he was in one of the R.O.T.C. units." (Professor Edward F. Miller, Head of the Mechanical Engineering Department, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in a letter dated January 26, 1931)

"We encourage the young men in our organization to obtain military training either in the National Guard or in the Officers' Training Corps, believing it is not only a

duty, but will be of advantage to them in business due to habits of discipline and organization which they acquire." (W. G. Mitchell, Assistant Manager, General Electric Company, West Lynn, Massachusetts, in a letter dated February 24,1931)

"Personally, I value highly the foundations built upon military training in the schools and colleges of our country. Students participating learn the right kind of subordination to authority and through such discipline develop qualities of leadership. One of the most valuable assets which come out of military training is an appreciation of organization and teamwork." (R. I. Rees, Assistant Vice President, American Telephone and Telegraph Company, in a letter dated February 24, 1931)

The writer has known thousands of young men who have had military training, and is convinced that in the majority of cases their personal efficiency has been increased by this training. The R.O.T.C. teaches respect for authority and develops the qualities of leadership, both of which are essential for success in life.

4. The opponents of military training claim that it teaches "militarism." What is militarism, anyway?

"Militarism--the giving of undue prominence to military training and to military glory; warlike or military spirit; used mostly in reference to European policy of maintaining great standing armies." (Funk and Wagnalls Standard Dictionary, 1919 Edition)

It is extremely difficult to see why the term "militarism," as defined above, should be applied to the system of military training in the United States today. As one writer expresses it:

"We are not sure that military drill, as conducted in our high schools and colleges, does our boys any appreciable harm. We fail to discover that the exercise produces any vicious sentiments, cruel disposition, or lust for war. On the contrary, we have seen boys improve physically under the regimen, develop a fine spirit of co-operation, become better sportsmen, and, in short, better boys." (Arthur Deerin Call, Editor, "The Advocate of Peace")

A prominent educator, former President David Kinley of the University of Illinois, has refuted the charge of "militarism" as follows:

"In my judgment a university, and particularly a state university, is an excellent place to give military training. Training there is bound by the very conditions to avoid militarism. The training is given in a civilian institution, from a civilian point of view, with emphasis upon citizenship, in connection with the study of other subjects, and

under the inspiration of university ideals. Under such conditions it is not likely to be over-emphasized, but takes its place as one subject in the curriculum."

"Declamation against militarism has no more serious place in an earnest and intelligent movement for righteousness in this country than declamation against the worship of Baal or Ashtaroth. It is declamation against a non-existent evil, one which never has existed in this country, and which has not the slightest chance of appearing here." (Theodore Roosevelt)

"The truth of the matter is that militarism or belligerency has little real connection with military training as such. I would suggest that we search our hearts for a clear understanding in this matter. We may be just as belligerent, just as militaristic in the conduct of our own lives and in our relationships with others, with or without military training

"History shows clearly that wars are more often caused by littleness of spirit, greed of place and power, underhandedness, misunderstandings brought about by individuals for their own profit than by any movement on the part of the military establishments." (Dr. Louis E. Lamborn, Head Master, the McDonogh School, McDonogh, Maryland)

"O America, art thou introducing the subtle psychology of militarism into the minds of thy boys to a degree that even Germany failed to attain?" askes W. C. Allen in "School and Society," October 16, 1926.

The whole pacifist cry is against a myth--the myth that

America is inhabited by some "militarists" who believe in war for war's sake, who believe in militarizing the entire nation with the view of provoking war, and who desire to inoculate high school boys with the spirit of war. The Land-Grant Colleges have had military training since the Civil War. During those 65 years, there has never been found a bit of evidence that teaching young men the hard, unpleasant business of war has induced any student to seek war. It is probable that no warmer friends of the Kellogg Pact can be found than among the young men who wear the R.O.T.C. uniform.

5. "What we need, more than military training, for our young people is a constructive peace training that will enable these young people, the leaders of tomorrow, to build the institutions of peace." (Rev. Walter W. Van Kirk, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, in a letter of December 29, 1930)

This opposition of military training is based upon the fallacy that the training causes a desire for war. There is a distinct difference between knowing how to handle a rifle and wanting to kill someone with a rifle. A desire for peace but not peace at any price, and a desire for preparedness but not for war, are reconcilable.

As President Hoover expressed it, in his Speech of Acceptance, 1928:

"There are two cooperating factors in the maintenance of peace--the building of good-will by wise and sympathetic

handling of international relations, and the adequate preparedness for defense."

The most effective efforts toward education for peace are not those directed against military training, but those which seek to teach college students an appreciation of international problems. In short, the true lover of peace will encourage courses in World Politics, History of Diplomacy, Foreign Policy, and International Relations, rather than seek to abolish the courses in Military Science.

"The R.O.T.C. teaches the student, in addition to various other things, law, history, military policy, world economics, and the duties and obligations as well as the privileges of citizenship." (President Matheson, Georgia School of Technology)

Thus we see that the Military Science course itself includes the study of history and foreign affairs. At Massachusetts Institute of Technology, all students enrolled in the Advanced R.O.T.C. Course are required by the Military Department to take the course in International Law.

"It is significant that many students who have expressed themselves as opposing military instruction are paradoxically enough found to be students who have little or no interest in the constructive agencies for the promotion of world peace. For example, at the University of North Dakota a student who expressed such uncompromising opposition to military training as to warrant his discharge from the local unit has never been found enrolled in a course for the study of international organization which is offered in the political science department at the university." (M. M. Chambers, "Every Man a Brick," page 86)

6. Military training should not be taught in a Christian College; it is contrary to the teachings of Christianity. With this thought in mind, the Federal Council of Churches, in June, 1926, made the following recommendations:

"That systematic and technical military training for youth of high school age is to be deplored as foreign to the aims and ideals of our education system.

"That civilian educational institutions should not make military training a required subject.

"That churches and educational leaders give careful study of the whole question of R.O.T.C. in schools and colleges."

Following this lead, the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, meeting in Kansas City in May, 1928, affirmed its unqualified opposition "to all military training in high schools and to compulsory military training in colleges."

The Third National Study Conference on the Churches and World Peace, meeting in Evanston, Illinois, February 25-27, 1930, called the attention of the churches "to the particular dangers of military compulsion, military propaganda, and military money inhering in War Department control of this military education in civil universities and schools."

This Conference then urged that "the National Defense Act should be revised and amended so that our Government, which has signed the Pact of Paris renouncing was as an instrument of national policy, will no longer aid in coercing school boys to prepare for battle."

Christian people everwhere hope that war will be abol-

ished, that the time will soon come when the nations can get together around a table and settle disputes without resort to arms. But it must not be supposed that world peace can be brought about by disarming the United States.

"America does not need to throw down her arms to prove that she has no aggressive intentions against other nations." (Hon. Dwight F. Davis, speech at Andover, Mass., June 13, 1923)

Those who oppose military training as being "un-Christian" should open their Bibles to St. Matthew's Gospel, 10:34, where the Saviour says:

"Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword."

When Our Lord drove the money lenders out of the temple, He used a scourge--the infantry weapon of his day. And He praised the centurion above all men when He said:

"Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Isreal." (Matthew 8:10)

"For the Lord Jesus Christ is not only the Prince of Peace, he is the Prince of War, too. He is the Lord of Hosts, the God of Armies, and whoever fights in a just war against tyrants and oppressors is fighting on Christ's side, and Christ is fighting on his side. Christ is his captain and his leader, and he can be in no better service. Be sure of it, for the Bible tells you so." (Rev. Charles Kingsley)

"I am utterly opposed to aggressive warfare. Yet, until the kingdom of heaven comes in the hearts of men, I believe in a reasonable preparedness, and training of our citizenship that they may be able to defend themselves in

time of need." (Rev. Dr. Clinton Wunder, Baptist Temple, Rochester, N. Y., January 1929)

Father Cullen is quoted as saying:

"For seventeen years we have had a military organization at St. Thomas College. Its benefits to the students, both physically and mentally are, in our experience, undoubted. Young men come to us awkward in gait, stooped in shoulders, and in-alert. In the course of one semester they acquire an agility of step, and a straightness of stature that shall constitute for them a valuable asset in whatever vocation they may enter."

"I am heartily in favor of military training in high schools and colleges. I would like to see all boys in the seventh grades in school trained in the simple rudiments of marching and squad drill. In high school and college, I would like to see military training made compulsory.

"The discipline of military training is splendid; the physical development that follows such training is needed by our American youth and especially that portion living in our cities. If war should come (God save us from another), our young men should have such training as to enable them to have an equal chance at least, with the youth of other nations, instead of being led into battle as sheep to the slaughter." (Rev. Howard E. Ganster, Rector Christ Church --Episcopal--Waukegan, Illinois)

7. Military drill does not provide the best form of physical training.

It provides a good form of physical training. Draft records show that fully one-half of our young men were physically unfit in 1917. Similar conditions existed in both the Civil and Spanish Wars.

"Hurried preparation for war always means great loss, great loss in efficiency and health." (Dr. V. V. Vaughan, "Infantry Journal," February, 1921, page 110)

As might be expected, physical training instructors, afraid of competition, usually oppose military training. In a few schools and colleges, the R.O.T.C. has been substituted for gymnasium work. Fearing the loss of their jobs, physical instructors have hastened to urge that military drill be abolished.

"What our school boys and girls need is not military training but good all-around physical education. This physical education must include health training. Military training for school boys, is mere 'millinery training'--it is a dolling up of boys, a make believe." (Dr. C. Ward Crampton, speech before American Physical Education Association, Chicage, April, 1919)

"Military drill in the colleges never has provided and in my judgment never can provide the kind of developmental activity essential in the organic development of young men." (Dr. Jesse F. Williams, Dept. Physical Education, Teachers' College, Columbia University)

"The introduction of military drill into the public

schools has been a serious blunder." (Dr. James H. McCurdy, International Y.M.C.A. College)

Most physical educators have made no study of military training. The few who have seem to be in favor of it.

"During the time I have been at Northwestern University as Director of Physical Education and Athletics, I have strongly advocated that our athletes join the military and naval R.O.T.C. units. The qualities of leadership that are so vital in an athlete are equally essential in members of the R.O.T.C. unit." (Kenneth L. Wilson, Northwestern Univ.)

"The lessons of leadership, courage, discipline, co-operation and loyalty that are gained from participation in athletics, when supplemented by military training, are of proven value to the future military leader called upon to defend his country. I believe that the military training now being given in colleges and universities, is exactly what is needed by the country." (Amos Alonzo Stagg, Coach, University of Chicago)

"From the standpoint of a former student, a soldier and a physician, I can come to no other conclusion but that the R.O.T.C. is most beneficial.

"Though there are those who claim that 2 or 3 hours a week will not benefit the young man physically, I disagree with them. The student constantly hears during these hours at drill, 'Stand up straight. Throw those shoulders back.' This makes an impression, if not on his conscious, then on his unconscious mind. Soon, despite himself, his posture improves." (Dr. David Stearns, official physician to Boston University's athletic teams).

The physical value derived from the R.O.T.C. is recognized by many college and university administrators.

"Its value as physical exercise and as a means of developing men with slight physical imperfections cannot be overrated." (Dr. T. O. Walton, President of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas)

"The child, by military training, gets practical and invaluable physical development. He learns team play, and after all, the ability to cooperate is of more value to the human being than the ability to compete." (Dr. Frank Crane)

President Pearson, Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts states that the R.O.T.C. "puts a premium on neatness, requires proper carriage, promotes the co-ordination of mind and body, and generates proper respect for authority."

President Coffman, University of Minnesota, considers military training "a decided asset in developing the students morally and physically."

Chancellor Day of Syracuse believes that the R.O.T.C. is "doing good work in setting the boys up and subjecting them to a wholesome discipline and training that they do not get in any other form of athletics."

President Brooks, University of Oklahoma, states that military training "contributes specially desirable forms of physical exercise not only for the development of health and physique but for the formation of permanent habits of control of the body which in my opinion will be valuable

assets through life."

That no other department does quite so much physically for the students as the Reserve Officers' Training Corps is the opinion of President Kent, New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts.

Every Regular Army officer has taken a thorough course in physical training in order to enable him to handle this type of work, both with Regular troops and with the R.O.T.C.

The R.O.T.C. Manual, Volume I, devotes 52 pages to the subject of physical training and 65 pages to military hygiene and first aid. These courses, which are carefully worked out in accordance with the most approved modern methods, form an important part of military training in American schools and colleges.

Schools which have other forms of military drill than the R.O.T.C. also place considerable stress upon the matter of physical development. As a rule, they provide for periodic physical examinations and setting-up exercises.

Let us now turn to the general benefits to be derived from military training.

The R.O.T.C. has an educational objective, honestly conceived and intelligently carried out. This is stated in Army Regulations #145-10, Section 1, Par. 3:

"The Reserve Officers' Training Corps will add to the educational resources of schools and colleges and will give to the student a training which will be as valuable to him in his industrial or professional career as it would be

should the nation call upon him to act as a leader in the defensive forces."

It must not be supposed that modern military training is a matter of "hard-boiled" drill masters--squads right--harsh and stern commands--gold braided uniforms. To be sure, drill is part of the course in Military Science, but it is not the whole course, by any means.

"The mathematics of the artillery units is as valuable as that taught in any other branch of the University. Topography, military law and other purely educational subjects improve the student's mind, no matter where he takes them." (President Brooks, University of Missouri, November 5,1925)

"The military work given is on a sound pedagogical basis and of excellent mental, disciplinary value." (Chancellor Avery, University of Nebraska)

"The unit of R.O.T.C. in the University of Chicago has made its place as an essential part of education. It is a distinct asset to us in the development of students. Military training I regard as of a unique value." (President Judson, University of Chicago)

"The military work does contribute an important and unique content to the education of the student. It develops probably more successfully than any other educational procedure the idea of teamwork and of looking ahead." (President Woods, University of Maryland)

"Our young men who have taken military courses have been benefited by them, both morally and physically. Through this training they acquire self-control and learn how both to obey

orders and to give the same. The discipline which they undergo has a very salutary effect." (President Hibben of Princeton)

"In military training there is a discipline that boys find all too rarely in the modern world. The discipline of the farm, where jobs must be done without question, has largely gone. The discipline of other work declines as living standards rise and boys work less. In military training remains a way to discipline and manliness for growing boys." (Chicago Tribune)

"I certainly cannot accept the contention that a course in military training has no place in the curriculum of a college. The function of a liberal arts college in particular is to prepare for life, and one part of life is the ability to protect one's country." (Dean Homer Albers, Boston University Law School)

"Education as education, school boys and college boys do not take seriously in this country, and they will not take it seriously until they feel a social pressure more effectively organized than any we now have.

"Young men do take military training seriously, they are set up and disciplined by it because they feel that it is linked to tremendous realities, because it is recognition of the solemn fact that nations have been obliged to repel invasions and to put down insurrection, and that the necessity may arise again. It is associated with convictions of obligation, with love of country, with loyalty and obedience." (Franklin H. Giddings, Professor of Sociology, Columbia University)

Woodrow Wilson, whom no one ever suspected of jingoism or a martial impulse, believed in military training in schools and colleges.

To a group of cadets whom he addressed in 1912, he said:

" I am always glad to see the uniform worn in connection with education. To me it has a deeper meaning than as an attribute of war. It means discipline, of course. In addition it signifies that the man is not living for himself alone.

" Modern people seem to hold a service they do to help themselves below the things they do to help others. So what I want you youngsters to remember is that you owe a duty to society which is above any interest you can have in self."

VII Summary and Conclusions

1. A nation may tempt war not only by its aggressive spirit, but also by a state of extreme unpreparedness.

"If war comes with Germany, it will be because of our unpreparedness and her belief that we are more or less impotent to do her harm." Letter of Col. House to Woodrow Wilson, July 14, 1915)

Certainly it is better to be ready for war and not have it, than to have war and not be ready for it!!

2. Soldiers fight wars which have been started by civilians.

3. Profiting by the painful experience of six wars, the nation has adopted the National Defense Act, of which the R.O.T.C. is an essential feature.

4. "It is ridiculous to assert, as some have done, that America is being Prussianized. No facts in support of such charges have been cited, nor could they be collected on any campus in America." (Report of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges, November, 1926)

5. "Compulsory" military training is an administrative detail, not a moral issue.

6. On the whole, it is preferable that military training be elective, especially in privately endowed schools and colleges.

7. Aside from the matter of National Defense, military training is educationally worthwhile, developing leadership, physique, citizenship, loyalty, and respect for auth-

ority.

8. Military training is increasing, rather than decreasing, in American schools and colleges.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

1. Allen, W. C.,"Preparedness and High Schools." School and Society: September 27, 1924.
2. Army Regulations 145-10 (Reserve Officers' Training Corps).
3. Association of Land-Grant Colleges, Report for 1926.
4. Barnes, Roswell P., Militarizing Our Youth. Committee on militarism in Education, 387 Bible House, Astor Place, New York City, 1927.
5. Boston University News, February 4, 1930.
6. Boston University Syllabus, page 317, published by the Class of 1929, College of Business Administration.
7. Boston University R.O.T.C. Rules and Regulations, September 1, 1930.
8. Carr, William G., Education for World Citizenship, Stanford University Press, California, 1928; 225 pages.
9. Chambers, Merritt M., Every Man A Brick! The Status of Military Training in American Universities, Public School Publishing Company, Bloomington, Illonois; 1927; 100 pages.
10. Collins, Ross A., The Army and Propaganda Power; speech in House of Representatives, January 10, 1930; Government Printing Office, Washington.
11. Coe, G. A., "What do Professors of Secondary Education think of Military Training in High Schools?" School and Society, August 6, 1927.
12. Davis, Bowers, "On the Reserve Officers' Training Corps," The Infantry Journal, September, 1930; page 290-294.

13. DeVeaux Register, catalogue of the DeVeaux School, Niagara Falls, New York.

14. Ganoe, William A., History of the United States Army, Appleton and Company, New York; 1924; 609 pages.

15. Gibbs, W. T., "Military Training of the Schoolboy--and His Later Life," The Infantry Journal, May, 1929; page 503.

16. Lane, W. D., Military Training in Schools and Colleges of the United States; Committee on Militarism in Education, 387 Bible House, Astor Place, New York City; 1926.

17. Little, Clarence C., The Awakening College, W. W. Norton & Company, Inc. New York, 1930; 282 pages.

18. Manlius School Catalogue, The Manlius School, Manlius, New York.

19. Marsh, Daniel L., Annual Report of the President of Boston University for 1925-26, page 26-28.

20. Massachusetts Committee on Militarism in Education, Military Training in the Schools and Colleges of Massachusetts; Boston; 1926

21. Matthews, Harry T., "The Place of Military Science in the College Curriculum," School and Society; January 21, 1928.

22 Mumm, W. M., Why Compulsory Military Training? Franklin County Chapter, Reserve Officers' Association, Columbus, Ohio; 1926.

23. National Defense, a Compilation of Opinions, U. S. Infantry Association, Washington, 1924.

24. National Defense Magazine, 30 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Illinois. Every issue deals with military training.

25. National Home Magazine, Pershing Looks At War, November, 1930.

26. National Security League, Military Training--Objections and Answers; 25 West 43rd Street, New York City.

27. O'Shea, M. V., "Educational Opportunity of the Military School," Nation's Schools; September, 1928.

28. O'Shea, M. V., "How Boys Are Benefited by a Military Regime," Nation's Schools; October, 1928.

29. Reserve Officers' Training Corps at Educational Institutions, Senate Committee Print, 67th Congress, 2d Session.

30. R.O.T.C. Manual, Volume I, U. S. Infantry Association; Washington, D. C.

31. Smith, Tucker P., So this is War! Committee on Militarism in Education, 387 Bible House, Astor Place, New York City.

32. Summerall, Charles P., "National Defense and the Educated Man," The Infantry Journal; October, 1930; page 337.

33. Thompson, W. O., "Military Training in the Land- Grant Colleges," The Infantry Journal; May, 1929; page 497.

34. Training Regulations 10-5, par. 3; Doctrines, Principles, and Methods; Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.

35. U. S. Army Studies in Citizenship, No. 2; Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.

36. Verbeck, William, The Ideal Military School, Manlius School, Manlius, New York.

37. Whitney, R. M., Peace at Any Old Price, The Beckwith Press, New York City; 1923.

38. Wilbur, William H., The Koehler Method of Physical Drill, J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia; 1918.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
1 1719 02575 1563